

**REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 22 June 2004. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 2 – 3 are now cancelled from this case, and Claim 1 is amended for further prosecution. Such cancellation and amendment of Claims are made purely in the interest of expediting prosecution in this case, and without addressing the merits of the substantive rejection set forth in the Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of the Sakanishi et al. Japanese reference and the Nakamura et al. reference. The Examiner, however, merely objected to Claim 2 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that the Claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.

Given this indication of allowable subject matter, Claim 1 is now amended to incorporate therein the recitations of Claim 2, and to remove a typographic informality incidentally noted therein. Claim 2 itself is cancelled from this case, along with Claim 3. Again, such amendment of Claim 1 and cancellation of Claims 2 – 3 are made in the interests of expediting prosecution of this case, in light of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, and made without addressing the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

MR2713-60  
Serial Number: 10/760,421  
Reply to Office Action dated 22 June 2004

It is now believed that Claim 1 is in allowable form. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & I LEE



Jun Y. Lee  
Registration #40,262

Dated: 9/15/2004

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.  
**04586**